

Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2011

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-65 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 10, 21, 22, 30, 39, 51, and 54 being the independent claims. Claims 1-22, 30, 39, 51, and 54 are sought to be amended. New claims 57-65 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objection to the Claims

The Examiner has objected to claim 22 for allegedly containing informalities. In particular, the Examiner notes that certain language appears twice in the claim. Applicant seeks to amend claim 22 to delete an instance of the word "to", such that the claim now reads, *inter alia*, "... in a form addressed for delivery to a network gateway, the network gateway configured to ..."

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-25, 27-33, 35-40, and 42-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-25, 27-33, 35-40, and 42-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,041,360 to Himmel in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,671 to Strentzsch et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2011

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “providing the frequently accessed domain names identified, responsive to the searching, to a communication interface in a cache message format of a network gateway.” These features are not taught or suggested by the combination of Himmel and Strentzsch. Support for this amendment is found, *inter alia*, at paragraph [0081] of the as-filed Specification, which reads:

[0081] At step 806, the frequently accessed domain names identified by the CPE search application are provided to the network gateway device 204a. In an embodiment, the CPE search application calls a software routine that packetizes the domain name information and transmits it to the network gateway device 204a over the communication interface 464. The packets carrying the domain name information may be formatted in accordance with a proprietary protocol type defined within the bounds of TCP/IP for identification and processing by the network gateway device 204a.

In the quoted embodiment, the CPE search application actively searches for and identifies the frequently accessed domain names for the purpose of providing them to the network gateway device 204a. This is different from merely requesting a URL (e.g., when clicking on a bookmark in a browser), where the request is routed through a gateway for caching.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify this behavior, reciting that the provision of the frequently accessed domain names that were *identified* is “responsive to the searching”. These are not just any of the frequently accessed domain names (e.g., whichever bookmark a user clicks on), but rather those that were identified as part of the search.

The Examiner relies on Himmel as allegedly teaching:

Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2011

(b) providing the frequently accessed domain names to the a communication interface (Col 4 lines 43-53; Col 18 lines 19-32 Fig. 1: item 40) in a form addressed for delivery to a network gateway (Col 5 line 66-Col 6 line 16; or “Uniform Resource Locator” is defined in RFC 1945, which is incorporated herein by reference. As is well known, the URL is typically of the format: `http://somehost/somedirectory?parameters . . .`” where “somehost” is the hostname position of the URL, “somedirectory” is a directory in which the web page may be found.) (*Office Action*, p. 3).

Himmel’s bookmarks work initially in the traditional method of bookmarks – a user clicks on the bookmark and is taken to the URL associated with the bookmark. (Himmel, 17:40-48). Himmel adds functionality for updating the bookmark with a new URL is the location referenced by the bookmark is no longer valid. (Himmel, 17:48-56). To the extent that URLs are provided to a communication interface, they are provided when a user clicks the bookmark, or possibly as part of an automatic update process. (Himmel, 18:1-9 and 31-52). It is never taught or suggested that only those “frequently accessed domain names” that are identified as part of a search are provided *responsive to the searching* itself.

In short, there is no teaching by which Himmel would *search* for frequently accessed domain names (no need to search – it knows where the bookmarks are) and, consequently, no teaching by which Himmel would provide any identified frequently accessed domain names *responsive to that search*, rather than responsive to a click or an update.

Strentzsch does not supply the missing teachings or suggestions, nor does the Examiner rely on Strentzsch to allegedly supply the missing teachings or suggestions. For at least the aforementioned reasons, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Himmel and Strentzsch. Independent claims 10, 21, 22, 30, 39, 51, and

Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2011

54 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Himmel and Strentzsch for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and further in view of their own respective features. The several rejected dependent claims are likewise not rendered obvious by Himmel and Strentzsch for at least the same reasons as their corresponding independent claims, and further in view of their own respective features.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-25, 27-33, 35-40, and 42-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Rejection of claims 6, 15, 26, 34, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 15, 26, 34, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Himmel in view of Strentzsch, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,248 to Gardos et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

For the reasons discussed above, claims 1, 10, 22, 30, and 39 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Himmel and Strentzsch. Gardos does not supply the missing teachings or suggestions, nor does the Examiner rely on Gardos as allegedly supplying the missing teachings or suggestions. Accordingly, claims 1, 10, 22, 30, and 39 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Himmel, Strentzsch, and Gardos. Claims 6, 15, 26, 34, and 41 each depend from claims 1, 10, 22, 30, and 39, respectively, and are likewise not rendered obvious by Himmel, Strentzsch, and Gardos for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 10, 22, 30, and 39, and further in view of their own respective features.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 15, 26, 34, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2011

New Claims

Applicant respectfully seeks entry of new claims 57-65. Claims 57-65 each depend from one of independent claims 1, 10, 21, 22, 30, 39, 51, and 54, and are likewise in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

In addition, Himmel does not teach or suggest that any frequently accessed domain names are provided “in a *cache message format* of a network gateway,” as recited in new claims 57-64. By way of non-limiting example, “packets carrying the domain name information may be formatted in accordance with a proprietary protocol type defined within the bounds of TCP/IP for identification and processing by the network gateway device 204a,” as recited in the as-filed Specification at paragraph [0081]. While the claim language is not as limiting as the cited language from the Specification, a “cache message format” at least conveys to the network gateway that the frequently accessed domain names are intended to be cached.

In contrast, Himmel simply makes URL requests when a bookmark is accessed or updated – there is no particular “cache message format” in Himmel, just a traditional URL request.

Claim 65 recites, *inter alia*, “providing a plurality of frequently accessed domain names in a *single transaction*.” Support for this amendment is found, *inter alia*, at paragraph [0081] of the as-filed Specification. In Himmel, bookmarks are updated when a user clicks the bookmark on an individual basis (i.e., individual HTTP requests would have to be issued for each bookmark), rather than in a single transaction as claimed.

Strentzsch and Gardos do not supply the missing teachings or suggestions. Accordingly, entry and allowance of new claims 57-64 is respectfully requested.

Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2011


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Salvador M. Bezos
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 60,889

Date: 21 NOV 2011

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

1393385_1.DOCX